



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to have been written, and is contrived to present a graphic picture of just the state of affairs that is thus described by Careaway:

"Such is the fashyon of the worlde now a dayes
That the symple innosaintes ar deluded
And an hundred thousand diuers wayes
By suttile and craftye meanes shamefullie abused
And by strength force, and violence oft tymes compelled
To belive and saye the moune is made of grene chese
Or ells haue great harme, and parcase their life lese."

And compare with the last two lines People's comment to *Res-publica* (l. 1779), speaking of Avarice, Oppression, Insolence, and Adulation:

"Madame, my Ladie, such Strussioners as these
have ofte made youe beelevé the Moone was a grene chese."

HAROLD NEWCOMB HILLEBRAND.

University of Illinois.

CHRISTOPHER ANSTEY UND DER "NEW BATH GUIDE"

Ein Beitrag zur Entwicklung der englischen Satire im 18. Jahrhundert von Walter Maier, Heidelberg, 1914, pp. 206.

In a letter to George Montagu of June 20, 1766, Horace Walpole made the following comment on Christopher Anstey's *New Bath Guide*, then recently from the press: "What pleasure you have to come! There is a new thing published, that will make you bippiss your cheeks with laughing. It is called the 'New Bath Guide.' It stole into the world and for a fortnight no soul looked into it, concluding its name was its true name. No such thing. It is a set of letters in verse, in all kind of verses describing the life at Bath, and incidentally everything else; but so much wit, so much humour, fun, and poetry, so much originality, never met together before. Then the man has a better ear than Dryden or Handel. Apropos to Dryden he has burlesqued his *St. Cecilia*, that you will never read it again without laughing. There is a description of a milliner's box in all the terms of landscape, painted lawns and chequered shades, a Moravian ode, and a Methodist ditty, that are incomparable, and the best names that ever were composed. I can say it by heart, though a quarto, and if I had time would write it you down; for it is not yet reprinted and not one to be had." (Cited, p. 149). Although this praise is but little exaggerated, fifty years later Miss Mitford remarked of the same book: "It is so far forgotten by the general reader, that the extracts upon which I venture will probably be as good as new." (Cited, p. 157).

Dr. Maier's study is a successful attempt to reconstruct the social and literary conditions out of which Anstey's satirical sketch of Bath life arose to a position of general popularity and to trace the effect of the *New Bath Guide* in the later development of prose and poetical satire. The comprehensiveness of his treatment is indi-

cated by the main divisions of the book: "Ansteys Leben," "Entstehung des *New Bath Guide*," "Analyse des Werks," "Die Lokaldichtung in Bath vor dem *New Bath Guide*," "Anlage," "Die äussere Gestalt," "Verbreitung und Aufnahme," "Nachahmungen," "Literarische Nachwirkung," and "Zusammenfassende Charakteristik Ansteys als Dichter. Die Stellung des *New Bath Guide* in der englischen Satire." A considerable merit of the treatment is that it assembles in convenient form a large fund of information which previously was so scattered as to be of little use. In addition, the book presents material which heretofore has not been noted. To the biographical matter furnished by Anstey's son and later editors Dr. Maier has added some important details gathered from manuscripts in the British Museum ("Leben," *passim*). The further results of his research are seen most clearly in the elaborate list of "Water Poems" which preceded Anstey's superior work (Section IV) and in the collection of satirical pieces produced in imitation of the *New Bath Guide* (Section VIII). In each of these divisions the author is usually on safe ground; the evidence submitted establishes the nature of Anstey's obligations and the extensiveness of the influence exerted by him. Although Anstey's work was confined to a byway of literature, it is evident that he raised this versified gossip to a plane of wide interest, that he fully established the advantage of various metrical devices for the purpose of whimsical satire, and that the plan of his epistolary poem furnished suggestions to later satirists. The study of his methods has, therefore, a real bearing on the history of social satire in the eighteenth century.

If the author has committed any inaccuracies (besides the error in Gray's name, p. 10), they are confined, I think, to his comments on the indebtedness of one or two writers to the *New Bath Guide*. The discussion of Smollett's *Humphrey Clinker* (pp. 181 ff.)—the one novel said to show direct obligation to Anstey—clearly establishes the fact of imitation. There is no occasion, however, wholly to set aside Dibelius' claim that Smollett was profiting by Richardson's example. Undoubtedly he took hints from each. The case of Goldsmith (pp. 183-4) is less certain. That he knew the poem is hardly to be doubted; but at most his imitation was limited to metrical form, and the fact that Goldsmith had written similar poems before 1766 strengthens Austin Dobson's view that Goldsmith's *The Haunch of Venison* and *Retaliation* were, like their predecessors, modeled upon the humorous poetry of Swift. In dealing with Byron, the author is attempting to prolong the results of the *New Bath Guide* beyond the period of its active influence. Byron knew Anstey's work and referred to it; in some of his rough-and-ready meter and his colloquial habit he also suggests the peculiar charm of the earlier work. Still, it does not follow that he deliberately imitated it: similar traits were to be found in many

poems of a date later than Anstey's and in a spirit more nearly identical with Byron's own temper. Dr. Maier refers to the fact that in correspondence with Hobhouse, Moore and Frere Byron vindicated his coarseness by referring to the practice of Anstey (p. 188). It is to be observed, however, that Byron included the *New Bath Guide* with the poetry of Little, Prior, and Chaucer and the novels of Fielding and Smollett: such a defense implies little with reference to Byron's peculiar estimate or imitation. Again, the argument based upon his use of "Moriah" as "the Goddess of Folly" (p. 190), though ingenious, can be accepted only on the basis of a very broad negative generalization, concerning the accuracy of which Dr. Maier himself is dubious. Certainly, too, the author is inclined to overstate Byron's professed admiration of Anstey (p. 189). The passage referred to in *Don Juan* (Canto XVI, str. 50), if taken with the context, is poor evidence; the "Bath Guide" was not openly flattered by being included with "Hayley's Triumphs" and "bouts rimes" as the principal reading of "her gracious, graceful, graceless Grace." In fact, the advent of Byron meant the fall of Anstey. The omission of these conjectural cases, however, would leave sufficient evidence that Anstey's effect on satire was not inconsiderable for a half-century.

A more evident fault in Dr. Maier's study is that it is too elaborate. If Christopher Anstey were Shakespeare or even Pope, the objection would disappear; but the exhaustive analysis of Anstey's metrical practices and the tabular view added (p. 134), the classification of his idiosyncrasies in rhyme (pp. 136 ff.), and the minute investigation of other stylistic peculiarities impress the reader in this particular instance as being meticulous. Even if all this mass of gratuitous information has the authority of prescription, the fact remains that it not only cumbers the treatment with material of little or no value to scholarship, but tends to give the subject of such analysis a factitious importance. The force of this objection becomes still more evident in Section V, where the author paraphrases the poem at great length and explains with pedagogic minuteness the peculiar humor of Anstey. In the first place, much of the reproduction leads to wearisome repetition of details that are necessarily given elsewhere in the book for the purpose of critical comment. In the second place, it is obvious that no detailed study of Anstey can have much value apart from Anstey's own work; an investigation of it can be significant only for those who have first-hand knowledge of the poem. If one reads Anstey, he is not in need of such a guide to appreciation; if he does not, no critical comment can give him the peculiar flavor of the poet's humor. Horace Walpole's huddled description, brief as it is, affords excellent suggestions; but he very wisely referred Montagu to the book itself. The real value of Dr. Maier's examination lies in the collection and organization of the historical material; in the critical and appreciative work he would have done well to make larger allowance for his reader's intelligence and sense of humor.

Trinity College.

C. A. MOORE.